

CCSU Special Education Department
Interim Assessment Report from AY 2014-15

Department: Special Education

Report Preparer: Joan Nicoll-Senft, PhD

Program Name and Level: MS Special Education (initial special education licensure, Post Baccalaureate in Special Education (initial special education licensure)

Program Assessment Question	Response
1) URL : Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	http://web.ccsu.edu/seps/departments/specEdu/?redirected
2) LO Changes : Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., LO more discrete, LO aligned with findings)	No changes were made to department's LOs during the 2014-1015 academic year. Two revised rubrics were piloted by faculty during the Fall 2014 semester faculty implemented newly re-aligned rubrics based on revised national standards CEC (Council for Exceptional Children, 2012).
3) Strengths : What about your assessment process is working well?	Nationally accredited by CEC and NCATE; one of three IHEs in Connecticut selected to work with the CT Department of Education on its federal CEEDAR grant to reform teacher preparation in the state.
4) Improvements : What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan should be reported here)	The department is currently focused on introducing the use of TaskStream for data collection and ongoing analysis of all assessments related to our learning outcomes. Several important curriculum changes have also been recently approved by the department and submitted to the Curriculum Committee for approval.

For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 5, 6 and 7 (you may add more rows if you have more than 5 LOs): LO #1) Students will demonstrate knowledge of foundational issues in special education and their impact on the field.	
<p>5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, , etc.)</p>	<p>The assessment aligned with this outcome is the Praxis II for Special Education licensure in Connecticut is test code 0543 or 5543: Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications. This 90 multiple-choice questions assess the knowledge and understanding of principles and practices related to special education and mild to moderate applications. The three constructed-response questions are integrated ones that assess an examinee’s knowledge of students with mild to moderate disabilities as related to instruction and assessment, learning environment and classroom management, and collaboration. This test consisted of three categories (Understanding Exceptionalities, Legal and Societal Issues, and Delivery of services to students with disabilities).</p> <p>Students take the Praxis II after they have completed all coursework except student teaching. Candidates take the Praxis II during the semester immediately prior to student teaching. Teacher Candidates must pass Praxis II in order to receive teacher certification from the Connecticut State Department of Education.</p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>This assessment is scored externally by its publisher, ETS. The cut score of 164 is determined by CT’s State Department of Education.</p>
<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Conclusion: Pass rate for TCs continues to be 100%.</p>
	<p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): Course content strongly aligned with this assessment. No changes necessary.</p>
	<p>Changes: Due to national trends in teacher preparation programs and data analysis the department has concluded that our current 2 credit (each) introductory courses (SPED 511, 512, 513) will be replaced with one 3 credit course (SPED 503) beginning in Fall 2016.</p>

1. LO #2) Students will demonstrate knowledge of the development and characteristics of learners, individual learning differences, and appropriate instructional strategies.	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The Ecological Case Study is an assignment focusing on the importance of learning environments and social interactions for students with exceptional learning needs this assignment is used in SPED 511, SPED 512, and SPED 513.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	This assignment is graded using a rubric to determine the candidate's level of performance on the assignment.
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: No changes are necessary in course content as 100% of students continue to pass at the Target or Acceptable categories.
	Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): Rubric scoring data.
	Changes: : Due to national trends in teacher preparation programs and data analysis the department has concluded that our current 2 credit (each) introductory courses (SPED 511, 512, 513) will be replaced with one 3 credit course (SPED 503) beginning in Fall 2016. This revision will simplify the data collection for this LO as well as enable additional course content in our methods courses.

<p>1. LO #3) Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze multiple forms of standardized and curriculum-based assessments and use that information for a variety of educational decisions.</p>	
<p>5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>The Assessment Report focuses on the interpretation of student data (provided to students) from the Woodcock Johnson III: Tests of Achievement (WJIII). This assignment requires students to interpret norm-referenced test scores and complete the following: 1) written interpretation of results, 2) present level(s) of academic achievement and functional performance, and 3) identify key elements of the student’s individualized educational plan.</p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>This assignment is graded using a rubric to determine the candidate’s level of performance on the assignment.</p>
<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Conclusion: 100% of teacher candidates achieved a score of Target or Acceptable on this assessment.</p>
	<p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): As a result of these data, several changes are planned involving the scope of this assessment.</p>
	<p>Changes: The standardized assessment used in this assignment has recently been revised. A training package and additional copies of the assessment were purchased by the department during Summer 2014 to allow for more intensive instruction and student practice with the materials. This has resulted in an increase of 8% of our candidates (during the 2013-2014 AY 92% of our candidates achieved a score of Target or Acceptable on this assessment).</p>

1. LO #4) Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze the individualized learning differences of students with exceptional learning needs.	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	The Student Learning Profile focuses on an in-depth analysis of a student's individualized learning differences. Each student completes a comprehensive Student Learning Profile on a student with an identified disability using resources provided by the instructor.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	This assignment is graded using a rubric to determine the candidate's level of performance on the assignment.
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: 100% of teacher candidates achieved a score of Target or Acceptable on this assessment.
	Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): Despite a strong performance on this assessment for our teacher candidates several changes were made to bring this assessment in better alignment with newly revised accreditation standards for the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC, 2012).
	Changes: This focus of this assignment has been revised from a student learning profile to the development of a universally designed lesson unit plan, which better aligns with the LO.

<p>1. LO #5) Students will demonstrate the ability to select, adopt, and use instructional strategies to promote learning and to modify learning environments for children with exceptional learning needs.</p>	
<p>5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>The Lesson Plan Sequence requires teacher candidates to plan and implement a series of five consecutive lessons to address the learning needs of an identified student in an academic area (reading, written language, or mathematics) and the implementation of evidence-based instructional practices.</p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>This assignment is graded using a rubric to determine the candidate's level of performance on the assignment.</p>
<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Conclusion: 100% of teacher candidates achieved a score of Target or Acceptable on this assessment.</p>
	<p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): This assignment is currently being revised to better align with CEC and CAEP accreditation requirements.</p>
	<p>Changes: The rubric and syllabus description for this assignment have been slightly revised to better reflect new national accreditation standards. These changes have minimal impact on the overall score of the assignment, but have resulted in more focused teaching and assessing of this LO. As a result our teacher candidates have increased from 91% meeting Target or Acceptable to 100% on this assessment.</p>

2. **LO #6)** Students will promote professional, ethical, and collaborative practices in the field of special education.

<p>5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>Our student assessment data indicates that 100% of teacher candidates, from both the Post Bachelorette Teacher Certification Program and our Masters of Science Cross Endorsement Program scored at the target or acceptable on our Student Teaching Evaluation (Assessment 4). This is a strong indicator of our teacher candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions within the field of special education.</p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>The Student Teaching Assessment is administered by the CCSU Supervisor, Cooperating Teacher, and the teacher candidate. This assessment is administered at the mid-point and end of each student teaching placement.</p>
<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Conclusion: 100% of teacher candidate scored at the target or acceptable on our Student Teaching Evaluation.</p>
	<p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): Upon closer analysis, the data revealed several relative strengths and areas for improvement, and faculty have used this data to make important programmatic changes</p>
	<p>Changes: . Changes based on this assessment are a revision of the department's lesson planning format, providing teacher candidates with additional instruction on lesson planning using explicit instruction, and the implementation of case study-based activities to provide candidates with guided practice in the identification and implementation of evidence-based practices.</p>

CCSU Special Education Department
Interim Assessment Report
Data Tables AY 2013-14

LO #1) Students will demonstrate knowledge of foundational issues in special education and their impact on the field.

Year	Test Category	Institution Average % Correct	State-Wide Average % Correct	National Average % Correct	Institution Pass Rate
2014- 2015	I. Development and Characteristics of Learners	82%	84%	82%	100%
	II. Planning and the Learning Environment	77%	79%	74%	100%
	III .Instruction	84%	85%	81%	100%
	IV. Assessment	77%	76%	73%	100%
	V. Foundations and Professional Responsibilities	82%	82%	77%	100%
	VI. Integrated Constructed Response Questions	72%	73%	63%	100%

LO #2) Students will demonstrate knowledge of the development and characteristics of learners, individual learning differences, and appropriate instructional strategies.

Year	Criteria	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
2014-2015	K1. Effects an exceptional condition(s) can have on an individual's life.	21%	79%	0%
	K2. Impact of learners; academic and social abilities, attitudes, interests, and values on instruction and career development.	29%	71%	0%
	K5. Differing ways of learning of individuals with ELN including those from culturally diverse backgrounds and strategies for addressing these differences.	21%	79%	0.0%
	S1.Relate levels of support to the needs of the individual.	21%	79%	0%

LO #3) Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze multiple forms of standardized and curriculum-based assessments and use that information for a variety of educational decisions.

Year	Criteria	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
2014-2015	CC8K3,4:Screening, pre-referral, referral and classification procedures; use and limitations of assessment instruments; CC8S: Gather relevant background data	100%	0%	0%
	CC8S2: Administer non-biased formal and informal assessments; CCS4: Develop or modify individual assessment strategies	50%	50%	0%
	CC8S5: Interpret information from formal and informal assessments; CC8S6: Use assessment information in making eligibility, program and placement decisions for individuals with exceptional learning needs, including those from culturally and /or linguistically diverse backgrounds.	50%	50%	0%
	CC8S7: Report Assessment results to all stakeholders using effective communication skills	100%	0%	0%

LO #4) Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze the individualized learning differences of students with exceptional learning needs.

Year	Criteria	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
2014-2015	A: CC3K2 Impact of learners' academic and social abilities, attitudes, interests, and values on instruction and career development; CC5S6 Uses performance data and information from all stakeholders to make or suggest modifications in learning environments.	6%	94%	0%
	B: CC3K1 Effects an exceptional condition(s) can have on an individual's life; CC5S3 Identify supports needed for integration into various program placements.	44%	56%	0%
	C: CC3K5 Differing ways of learning of individuals with exceptional learning needs including those from culturally diverse backgrounds and strategies for addressing these differences; CC5S3 Identify supports needed for integration into various program placements.	22%	78%	0%
	D: GC5S3 Plan instruction in a variety of educational settings.	56%	44%	0.00%
	E: CC9S2 Uphold high standards of competence and integrity and exercise sound judgment in the practice of the professional	100%	0%	0%

(5) Students will demonstrate the ability to select, adopt, and use instructional strategies to promote learning and to modify learning environments for children with special needs and the ELN by designing a five lesson plan sequence, scored by a rubric.

Year	Criteria	Target (7 points)	Acceptable (5-6 points)	Unacceptable (0-4 points)
2014-2015	CC4SE. Select, adapt, and use instructional strategies and materials according to characteristics of the individual with ELNs.	6%	94%	0%
	GC4S1. Use research-supported methods for academic and nonacademic instruction of individuals with disabilities.	44%	56%	0%
	GC4S7. Use appropriate adaptations and technology for all individuals with disabilities.	22%	78%	0%
	GC4S12. Use responses and errors to guide instructional decisions and provide feedback to learners.	56%	44%	0%

LO #6) Students will promote professional, ethical, and collaborative practices in the field of special education.

Year	I. Classroom Environment	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A
2013-2014	1. Management of Classroom Learning Environments 2.4, 2.5, (II C,) (3.4, 1.0)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	2. Management of Routines 2.5, (II C), (3.4)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	3. Fostering a Learning Community 2.1, (II B & C), (3.4, 1.0)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	4 Expectations of Standards of Behavior NON NEGOTIABLE 2.3, 2.4, (II B), (3.4)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	5. Monitoring of and Response to Student Behavior NON NEGOTIABLE 2.3, 2.4, (II A), (3.4, 1.0)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	6. Promoting Engagement and Shared Responsibility for Learning 2.2 III B)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	II. Planning	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A
	7. Lesson Objective 3.2, (I C), (3.1)	50%	50%	0%	0%

	8. Sequence of the Lesson 3.1, 3.2, (I C), (3.1)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	9. Lesson Planning NON NEGOTIABLE 3.2, 3.6, 3.7, (I A & C), (3.1)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	10. Selecting Appropriate Resources and Assessment Strategies when Planning the Lesson 3.4, 3.5, (II D), (3.1)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	11. Meeting the Needs of All Learners by Differentiating Instruction 3.7, (II D)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	III. Instructions	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A
	12 . Material Usage During Instruction 4.2, 4.3, (II D), (3.3)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	13. Methods 4.1, 4.3, (II A & D), (3.3, 1.0)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	14. Communication During Initiation NON NEGOTIABLE 4.1, 4.3, 4.7, (I B) ,(3.3, 1.0)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	15. Communication During Closure NON NEGOTIABLE 4.7, (I B), (3.3, 1.0)	50%	50%	50%	0%
	16. Knowledge of Content Areas NON NEGOTIABLE 1.1, 1.2, (I A), (3.1)	50%	50%	0%	0%

	17. Promotes Independent Thinking through Questioning 3.8, 4.3, 4.4, 4.7, (II A & D), (3.3, 1.0)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	18. Monitors Student Learning 4.6, (II D), (4.0)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	IV. Assessing for Learning	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A
	19. Student Learning, Instruction, and Data Collection 5.2, 5.3, (II D), (4.0)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	20. Monitoring Students' Understanding 4.6, (II D), (4.0)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	21. Providing Feedback that Focuses on Content and Assists Students in Improving their Performance 5.5, 5.6, (II D), (4.0)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	V. Communication	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A
	22. Oral and Written Language 1.3, (I B,) (3.5)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	VI. Professionalism	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A
	23. Professional Attitude Toward Teaching and Dependability 6.11, (III A & B), (5.2)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	24. Professional Attire 6.4, (III A)	100%	0%	0%	0%

	25. Maintaining Confidentiality NON NEGOTIABLE 6.7, 6.11, (III A), (5.2)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	26. Professional Collaboration/Communication with Others 6.3, 6.4, (III D), (5.2)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	27. Professional Collaboration in Data Team Setting 6.3, 6.4 ,(III D), (5.2)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	28. Use of Communication Technology NON NEGOTIABLE 6.9	100%	0%	0%	0%
	VII. Student Diversity	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A
	29. Developing a Positive Self- concept 2.1, 2.3, 5.7, 6.6, (II B & III B), (3.2)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	30. Understanding Individual Students 6.8, 6.2, (II A, B & C), (3.2)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	VIII. Self-Evaluation and Reflection	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A
	31. Continuous Self-evaluation 6.1, (III B), (5.1)	50%	50%	0%	0%
	32. Integration of Feedback 6.1, (II B), (5.1)	50%	50%	0%	0%

	33. Professional Growth 6.2, (III C & D), (5.1)	100%	0%	0%	0%
--	--	------	----	----	----